

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance because the claims are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references. The following paragraphs provide the justification for this belief. In view of the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject patent application.

1.0 Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action of November 16, 2004, claims 1-29 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1.1 Rejection of Claims 1-29:

Claims 1-29 were rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. The Office Action suggests that since independent claim 1 is a system/apparatus claim, it requires means/components for performing all of the steps recited in the claim.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to further recite "***using a computing device for performing the following steps.***" It is believed that the addition of this limitation serves to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 by specifying the cooperative means (the "computing device") by which the all of the steps are performed. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112 in view of the aforementioned amendment to claim 1, as cited above in the **Listing of Claims** beginning on page 2 of this paper.

1.2 Rejection of Claim 55:

Claim 55 was rejected as being failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “computer-implemented process” in line 1 of the claim. Applicant agrees. This is a typographical error. Claim 55 has now been amended to recite a limitation of a “computer-readable medium” in place of the erroneous “computer-implemented process.”

It is believed that the correction of claim 55 by the addition of the aforementioned limitation serves to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 by providing a proper antecedent basis for the elements of the claim. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. §112 in view of the aforementioned amendment to claim 55, as cited above in the **Listing of Claims** beginning on page 2 of this paper.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-55 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1-29 and 55 and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Watson

Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant

Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855